

**Application No. 10/669,341 (CHEN) Amendment A, cont.**

**Remarks-Argument**

1. In the specification, the paragraphs [ 0014 ], [ 0021 ], [ 0022 ], [ 0023 ], [ 0038 ], [ 0041 ], [ 0043 ], [ 0045 ], [ 0051 ] and [ 0052 ] are amended to correct minor errors, No new matter has been introduce in.
2. In the Abstract, the minor errors are corrected and a repeated phrase is deleted.
3. The claims 1-3 of record are currently amended in accordance with the suggestions of the Examiner in the above Office Action and made the claimed subject more definite in or to overcome the rejections to the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112.
4. The cited not relied-upon prior art references have studied and are greatly appreciated.

**IN RESPONSE TO THE REJECTION TO CLAIM UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**

5. The German patent 2,305,239 discloses a sliable windshield wiper which is prominent to a articulation plate (10) and which has a sloped edge (11) and straight edge (9) on two lateral side that is different from the articulation rod of the present invention both in the concept and the design because the sloped edge (111) and the straight edge (112) of the articulation rod (11) are formed on a lower end and made engageable with the top of the arm (10) which is prominent on the simple structure and reliable than the articulation plate (10) and proves that the German patent does not teach the articulation rod of the present invention so that the rejection to the claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully traversed.

6. In view of the Examiner, the claims 2-3 of record are allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and rejection to claim 1 is supposedly traversed. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**Application No. 10/669,341 (CHEN) Amendment A, cont.**

**Request for constructive Assistance**

Applicant has made a diligent effort in amending the specification, the claims and the Abstract in order to put the present invention into the condition for allowance. If the Examiner find other area in need of correction, applicant request for constructive suggestion from the Examiner as pursuant to MPEP§ 706.03(d), and more particularly if further objections be found with the claims, for the Examiner to draft one or more allowable claims as pursuant to MPEP§707.07(j).

**Very Important**

★ Please Post Office Address:



**[Mailing Address]**

**TO : P.O. Box 697,  
Feng-Yuan City 420,  
Taichung Hsien,  
TAIWAN, R.O.C.**

Very respectfully

CHEN, CHIH-WEI

**CHIH-WEI CHEN**

Applicant Pro Se

P. O. Box 697,

Feng-Yuan City ,

Taichung Hsien,

**TAIWAN 420, R.O.C.**

Dec. 24, 2004

**※ (Avoid mail get lost)**

**● The inspection of Air Letter Document:**

The applicant is personally without entrusting an attorney which causes the USPTO avoid sends the patents to wrong address.

Because the address did not contain the republic of China (R.O.C.) after TAIWAN. Which may caused that Office Action delivered to a wrong addressee.

Please be sure to have our "country" typed on the envelop (**TAIWAN, R.O.C.**). Otherwise, the mailed Office letter could be lost.